

Chapter 10

The Hispanic Press in the United States: Content and Prospects

OFELIA GARCIA, JOSHUA A. FISHMAN,
SILVIA BURUNAT and MICHAEL H. GERTNER

INTRODUCTION

Although there were over thirty-eight million people in the United States who claimed a language other than English as their mother tongue in 1979 (Fishman, Chapter 6, This Volume), the shift to English among all ethnolinguistic groups in the United States by the third generation is a continuing and well-known phenomenon (Fishman 1966, Fishman et al. 1982, Veltman 1983). Despite recent legislative and judicial policies that *seem* to encourage, protect or even require the use of ethnic mother tongues in public domains among those whose English is limited or nonfunctional, the anglicization of ethnolinguistic minorities in the United States continues at a relentless pace (see also Hudson-Edwards and Bills 1982, Lieberson and Curry 1971, López 1976 and 1982, Skrabanek 1970, Stevens 1982). In the absence of public policy that would effectively safeguard ethnic mother tongues in the United States *even after English is acquired* by those who use these tongues, ethnic institutional support would appear to be doubly essential for the maintenance of non-English languages and non-Anglo ethnicities in the United States. One such institution might be the ethnic press which can serve either to maintain foreignness, develop ethnicity as an indigenous system in the United States, or to accelerate assimilation. The purpose of this paper is twofold: (a) to examine the size and content of the Hispanic press in comparison with the press of three other major American ethnolinguistic groups: French, German and Yiddish, and, (b) to compare the views toward the Spanish language and Hispanic ethnicity held by the Hispanic press written in Spanish and that written in English.

Table 1. Growth in number and circulation of Hispanic Press, 1960-1980.

	Number	Circulation
1960	49	(40)* 507,000
1980	165	(86) 2,499,014
Change 1960-80	+ 236.7%	+ 392.9%

*Numbers in parenthesis represent the number of publications for which circulation figures are available.

Sources: Joshua A. Fishman et al. 1966, and Fishman et al., Chapter 7, This Volume.

SIZE OF THE HISPANIC PRESS

The non-English press in the United States traces its origins back to Ben Franklin's *Die Philadelphische Zeitung* of 1732 (Fishman, Hayden and Warshauer 1966). Some 75 years later, in 1808, the first issue of *El Misisipi* appeared in New Orleans. This *bilingual* four-page periodical marks the beginning of the Hispanic press in the United States (Gutiérrez 1980). Since then, several periods of growth have been followed by others of decline (See e.g., Grove et al. 1975).

In 1960 the Language Resources Project (Fishman et al. 1966) identified 49 Spanish language publications in the United States with a total known circulation of 507,000. An update of this data has revealed enormous growth (Fishman et al., Chapter 7, This Volume). By 1980 the Language Resources III Project had identified 165 Spanish language publications in the United States.¹ This indicates an increase of 236.7 percent from 1960 to 1980. The 86 publications for which circulation figures were available show a total known circulation of 2,499,014. This represents a dramatic 392.9 percent increase in circulation from 1960 to 1980 (Table 1).

The proportion of the entire non-English press in the United States that is represented by the Hispanic press has also increased (Table 2). Whereas in 1960 Hispanic publications represented only 9.5 percent of the total number of mother-tongue publications, in 1980 they represented 16.1 percent of the total. This 16.1 percent figure is particularly noteworthy when we realize that the Polish press, which follows in number of publications, accounts for only 6.4 percent of all mother-tongue publications. Thus, the Hispanic press is more than twice the size of the next largest non-English press in the United States. The circulation data reveals the same type of increase (Table 3). Although the circulation of the Hispanic press represented nearly 13.5 percent of the total circulation of all non-English publications in 1960, in 1980 it represents nearly 39 percent of the total. This increase is all the more impressive if we realize that the Italian press, which has the next largest circulation, represents only 8.7

Table 2. Total number of Hispanic publications and total number of non-English mother-tongue publications, 1960 and 1980.

	Hispanic Publications	Total non-English mother-tongue publ.	Hispanic percentage of total
1960	49	517	9.5%
1980	165	1022*	16.1%
Change 1960-80	+ 236.7%	+ 97.7%	+ 6.6%

*This total represents all non-English mother-tongue publications identified by Language Resources III as of August 1982 but omits 9 publications published in Puerto Rico.

Sources: See Table 1.

Table 3. Circulation of Hispanic publications and total circulation of non-English mother-tongue publications, 1960 and 1980.

	Hispanic Publications	Total non-English mother-tongue publ.	Hispanic percentage of total
1960	(40)* 507,000	(471) 3,759,000	13.49%
1980	(86) 2,499,014**	(542) 6,414,166**	38.96%
Change 1960-80	+ 392.9%	+ 70.6%	+ 25.47%

*Numbers in parenthesis represent the number of publications for which circulation figures were available.

**These figures omit the circulation of 4 publications published in Puerto Rico.

Sources: See Table 1.

percent of the total circulation of non-English publications. Indeed, the Hispanic proportion of circulation increased even more substantially from 1960 to 1980 than did the Hispanic proportion of the number of non-English mother-tongue publications.

The increases in both number and circulation of the non-English press in general, and of the Hispanic press in particular, may, to some extent, be more apparent than real, i.e., it *may* be due to nothing more than possibly greater success encountered by the Language Resources Project in 1979-1982 in identifying every known non-English publication in the United States relative to its success in 1960-1963. However, the expansion of the Hispanic press *vis à vis* the other ethnic press is obviously also directly related to the dramatic growth of the Hispanic population in the United States. Thus, although the trend figures seem encouraging regarding the vitality of the Hispanic press, it is worth remembering that the 1980 census accounts for 11.1 million home-speakers of Spanish over five years of age, out of the almost 23 million home-

speakers of non-English languages (PHC 80-SI-1, March 1982). From these figures we can determine that although Spanish accounts for almost 50 percent of all non-English speakers in the United States in 1980, Hispanics are served by only approximately 16 percent of all non-English publications. Thus, Hispanics are actually grossly under-represented with respect to having a mother-tongue press of their own, when compared to various other ethnolinguistic minorities (Fishman et al., Chapter 7, This Volume). It appears, then, that the increase in number and circulation of the Hispanic press is not as impressive as the increase in the Hispanic population itself and, indeed, the press increase is far from indicating a growing or even proportionally equivalent institutional base for Spanish language and ethnicity in the United States.

SPANISH LANGUAGE AND ETHNICITY IN THE SPANISH LANGUAGE PRESS

In an effort to determine the view of the Hispanic press toward Spanish language and ethnicity, Language Resources III conducted an intensive content analysis of a 1980 press sample of 11 Hispanic publications (see Appendix 1) stratified by region and frequency of publication. Comparison samples of the French, German and Yiddish press in 1980 were also content-analyzed (Gertner et al., Chapter 9, This Volume). All articles in that sample which contained explicit references to either the ethnic mother tongue or ethnicity in the United States were pulled out for analysis. A coding manual with 51 topics pertaining to the ethnic mother tongue and ethnicity was developed.² Any explicit mention of a specific ethnic topic was noted.

In an effort to analyze the results of the content analysis of the Hispanic press vis-à-vis the French, German and Yiddish press, the 51 topics mentioned above have been grouped under two major themes in this paper: (a) the ethnic mother tongue (Spanish) and (b) Hispanic ethnicity. Although our sample consisted of both ethnic mother tongue and English language items in the Hispanic press, we will limit our analysis of the data in *this section* to the content expressed in the ethnic mother tongue itself. Below we will review the data derived from English items in the Hispanic press pertaining to the Spanish language and to Hispanic ethnicity.

If we compare the percentages of references about the ethnic mother tongue and ethnicity that appear in the four ethnolinguistic press samples studied, we immediately realize that the non-English press in the United States is overwhelmingly more interested in ethnicity than in the ethnic mother tongue (Table 4.).

Table 4. *Percentages of references to the ethnic mother tongue* and to ethnicity in four non-English press samples (EMT items only).*

	French	German	Yiddish	Spanish	Overall
EMT	50.1%**	24.4%	29.4%	14.8%	23.7%
Ethnicity	87.7%	94.7%	97.3%	95.4%	95.3%

* Ethnic mother tongue appears hereinafter as EMT.

** All figures indicate the percentages of items in a particular press sample which refer to the indicated topic. The percentages are rounded to one decimal place. The figures in each column can add up to more than 100% because one content-analyzed item may cover both topics.

Table 5. *Percentage of positive, neutral or negative references to the ethnic mother tongue in four ethnolinguistic press samples (EMT items only)*

	French	German	Yiddish	Spanish
Total items analyzed	641	2113	2972	3977
Total ref. to EMT	321	516	876	588
% Negative ref.	0%	.4%	.7%	54.3%
% Neut. or pos. and neg.	100%	99.4%	99.2%	43.9%
% Positive ref.	0%	.2%	0%	1.9%

The Spanish language press also reflects this greater interest in ethnicity (95.4% of all items) over interest in the ethnic mother tongue (14.8% of all items).

With regard to the ethnic mother tongue, however, it is clear from Table 4 that *the Spanish language press sample shows far less interest in this topic than do the other three ethnic mother-tongue press samples*. Furthermore, it is significant that while most of the references to the ethnic mother tongue in the French, German and Yiddish press samples express a neutral attitude toward the language, more than half of the references in the Spanish language press sample reveal a negative attitude toward the language (Table 5).

It is common, for example, to find columns, editorials and letters to the editor that repeat the prevailing negative attitude toward the Spanish language in the United States that is summarized in the following quote from an article in *La Opinión*, the Los Angeles daily: "En el castellano actual abundan las palabras y expresiones corruptoras, que empobrecen el lenguaje." (In today's Spanish there is an abundance of corrupting words and expressions that impoverish the language.) In Miami, *El Diario Las Américas* runs a daily column devoted to the Spanish language and its use in the United States entitled "Cuestiones Gramaticales." Olimpia Rosado, the Cuban author of the column, constantly and severely chastises those who use English loans and calques when speaking

and writing Spanish, purportedly in order to defend the puristic, old-country standard. For example, the use of the loanshift "casual" in an advertisement that appeared in the same newspaper was the subject of the most vehement criticism in one of her columns. She accused Spanish users in the United States of being careless and lazy and ended by saying: "¡Claro! es más fácil echar mano del homónimo." ("Of course! It is easier to grab the homonym.") Her criticism is far sharper and more memorable than her defense.

The attitude expressed by the mostly foreign-born journalists toward the Spanish language is pervasively negative. Spanish in the United States is seen as debased and corrupted by the English influence. These journalists hold an old-country purist mentality toward the standard and refuse to accept changes introduced by bilingual speakers and writers of Spanish in the United States. As Fishman (1972) has pointed out, this stigmatization of the prevailing dialect by purists who only accept the old-country standard could, in effect, promote shift to English. Thus, the Spanish language press can wittingly or unwittingly be a promoter of shift to English and function in opposition to Spanish-language maintenance in the United States.

Foreign-born journalists are not the only source of criticism of the Spanish language in the press. American businesses that advertise in Spanish for Hispanic clientele are explicit about the uselessness of Spanish in the United States. A chiropractic clinic in Los Angeles finished the Spanish-language ad it ran in the June 1st issue of *La Opinión* by saying: "Lamentamos no hablar español. Traiga su intérprete." (We regret that we do not speak Spanish. Bring your interpreter.) Another advertisement in the same issue of the newspaper by the California College of Dental Training, also written in Spanish, ends by shifting to English and saying: "Some English please." Thus Spanish in the United States must be seen as not only structurally impoverished, but also as functionally limited by those who read the Spanish language press.

It is instructive to realize that most of the Spanish-language press is *not* owned by Hispanics who live in the United States, but either by Americans who are non-Hispanic or by foreign-born Latin American entrepreneurs. This signals an important difference with the press of other ethnolinguistic minorities in the United States, which is generally owned by members of the communities served. The non-Hispanic majority's prevailing negative attitude toward the Spanish language in the United States is indeed the one that permeates the Spanish language press. Thus, it seems that the Spanish-language press sample is not only *less interested* in the ethnic mother tongue than are the other three comparison press samples in theirs, but it is also far more *often negative* regarding the Spanish language. This negative attitude is even more destructive than the almost complete lack of ideologized support toward the ethnic mother tongue that characterizes all of the studied press samples. Thus, although the Spanish-language press may serve as a valuable vehicle of communication with a

monolingual foreign-born population, it is not only uninterested in developing loyalty toward Spanish but attacks that language as well.

The Spanish language press sample seems to be as concerned as the other three presses with ethnicity more generally (Table 5). However, we again find it expressing more negative attitudes toward Hispanic ethnicity than do the other ethnolinguistic press samples toward either French, German or Jewish ethnicity (Table 6).

Table 6. *Percentage of positive, neutral or negative references to ethnicity in four ethnolinguistic press samples (EMT items only).*

	French	German	Yiddish	Spanish
Total items analyzed	641	2113	2972	3977
Total ref. to ethnicity	562	2000	2891	3796
% Negative ref.	0%	.1%	.1%	54.4%
% Neut. or pos. and neg.	100%	99.8%	99.9%	44.4%
% Positive ref.	0%	.1%	0%	1.2%

Whereas the French, German and Yiddish press samples express a mostly neutral attitude toward their own ethnicity, slightly over half of the references to Hispanic ethnicity in the Spanish language press express a negative attitude. This overwhelming negativism toward both Spanish language and Hispanic ethnicity is further indicative of the fact that the circulation growth and commercial importance of the Spanish-language press are due only to increased Hispanic immigration into the United States rather than to positive programmatic advocacy on the part of that press. Indeed, the Spanish-language press seems to concern itself primarily with problems of a foreign-born minority still largely involved in searching for "the American dream" of economic mobility and sociocultural assimilation. As a result, it avoids issues of positive ethnic activism which have recently become more pertinent (although not unconflictedly so) to second and particularly third-generation Hispanics writing primarily in English (See below).⁴

The negative self-image of Hispanics projected by the Spanish language press is possibly also a result of majority ownership of that press. This points to the similarity between the United States Spanish-language press and the United States Black press, both mostly owned by the white Anglo majority. The fact that Blacks and Hispanics in the United States have not been structurally incorporated into the mainstream has made it more difficult for them to develop a strong network of minority-owned sociocultural institutions which could promote a positive ethnic identity. However, the civil rights movement in the

United States resulted in the development of a militant Black press which has helped shape the identity of the Black community in the United States since then (La Brie 1974, Tinney and Rector 1980). Furthermore, since the 1960s the militant Black community has pressed for extensive coverage of Black issues by the white media. Thus, Blacks have made strides in gaining support for their ethnicity from the majority at large, as well as from the institutions serving them directly. In contrast, Hispanics, by continuing to rally solely around language rights have failed to reap all the benefits of the civil rights movement. Thus, they have been left with little support from the United States majority and in the hands of either a foreign-born, well-to-do Hispanic minority or of non-community interests that do not share their lot.

The fact that the Spanish-language press is so negative toward the maintenance of the Spanish language and Hispanic ethnicity seems contradictory since it would seem to threaten its own existence. However, the Spanish-language press can still afford to be relatively negative vis-à-vis these matters since there is a continuous influx of monolingual readers. This overreliance on newly arriving monolinguals also characterized the flourishing German press and the booming Yiddish press (Fishman 1965) at the beginning of the century. In 1910 the German press accounted for 53.1 percent of the non-English ethnic mother-tongue press (Fishman, Hayden and Warshauer, 1966). The fact that in 1982 the German press accounted for only 5 percent of the ethnic mother-tongue press should serve as a warning to the Hispanic community. If maintenance of Spanish language and ethnicity is important to Hispanics, then the support of an ethnic-owned Spanish press may well be essential, and not only in order to bolster Hispanic ethnolinguistic continuity, but in order to maintain the Spanish press itself.

FOREIGNNESS, ETHNICITY AND ASSIMILATION

In order to determine further the view of the Spanish press with regard to Hispanic identity in the United States, the ethnicity topics that were included in our content analysis have been divided according to a continuum that would indicate whether the press serves to maintain foreignness, develop ethnicity as an indigenous system or accelerate assimilation. The following six categories were constructed.*

1. Foreignness. Old Country orientation. Alienation from mainstream.
2. Push from the United States. Rejection. Alienation.
3. Pull toward Old Country. Nostalgia for old ways. Alienation.

* For a complete listing of the topics pertaining to these categories and the percentages of references obtained in each, see Appendix 2.

4. Ethnicity in the United States. Acculturation.
5. Ethnic activism. Active Cultural Pluralism.
6. Assimilation. Melting Pot.

For the purpose of our analysis, the first three categories reveal a foreign orientation, the next two emphasize adapting but maintaining ethnicity in the United States, while the last serves as an indicator of assimilation. By classifying content analysis topics into these categories we can determine whether the ethnic press reveals a foreign orientation, an ethnic maintenance orientation or an assimilationist orientation (Table 7).

Table 7. *Percentage of ethnicity references in four ethnolinguistic press samples by categories and orientations (EMT items only)**

	French	German	Yiddish	Spanish
Old country	42.1%*	38.9%	51.9%	39.3%
Push	.7%	.3%	5.6%	5.1%
Pull	4.4%	2.0%	7.0%	6.8%
I. Average Foreign Orient.	15.7%	13.7%	38.1%	19.7%
Ethnicity U.S.	11.0%	11.3%	16.1%	13.7%
Ethnic activism	2.2%	.9%	5.0%	3.6%
II. Average Ethnic Orient.	6.6%	6.1%	10.6%	8.7%
III. Assimilation Orientation	.5%	0%	.3%	.8%
Total items analyzed	641	2113	2972	3977

* All figures indicate the percentages of items in a particular press sample which refer to the indicated category.

The percentages are rounded to one decimal place. The figures in each column do not add up to 100 percent because one content-analyzed item may cover many of these categories or none at all.

An analysis of the percentage of references dealing with each orientation reveals that each of the studied press samples is overwhelmingly old country oriented. The Yiddish language press sample shows the highest degree of interest in such topics (51.9%). Indeed, it yields the highest percentages of references pertaining to the foreignness orientation as a whole, and to each of its individual components. At the same time, it also yields the highest percentages for the ethnicity orientation. The fact that the Yiddish press sample obtains the second lowest percentage of references in the assimilationist orientation coupled with the high percentages in the first two orientations, indicates the commitment of the Yiddish press to the preservation of Jewish ethnic con-

tinuity in the United States. The Holocaust experience is probably contributory to this development since Yiddish journalists in the United States may well feel that theirs is a special responsibility to maintain and develop the memories and the culture so cruelly exterminated in Eastern Europe.

How does the Spanish press sample compare to the other three ethnic mother-tongue press samples? The Spanish press sample seems to be slightly more oriented toward the foreignness or alienation of the ethnic group than either the French or the German press samples, although it is only half as interested in the old country and in issues of alienation from the mainstream as the Yiddish press sample (See Table 7). If the press is an accurate reflection of its community, then the alienation of Hispanics, whether as a result of "push" experiences (rejection in the United States) or of "pull" commitment (attraction toward the old country), is second only to that felt by Yiddish journalists and readers in the United States, although it is less so than that of the French or the German press samples (See Table 7, I. Average Foreign Orientation).

In response to "push" (alienation due to rejection by others) Hispanics are beginning a process of self-categorization based on ethnic values and ideology. This is reflected in our data by the fact that the percentage of references to "pull" (nostalgia for old country, old ways) is slightly greater (6.8%) than the percentage of references to "push" (5.1%). In fact, it seems that for all four language groups, the alienation and separateness referred to in the ethnic press is more a result of "pull" (self-categorization) than of "push" (categorization by others).

With regard to ethnicity maintenance, the Spanish press sample is slightly more interested in topics dealing with cultural pluralism and ethnic activism than either the French or the German press samples, although it again is surpassed by the Yiddish language press sample in this orientation (See Table 7).

It is noteworthy that the Spanish-language press sample is slightly more preoccupied with assimilation and integration than is either the French, German or Yiddish press sample. Although the Spanish press sample demonstrates a slightly higher interest in both ethnicity in the United States and ethnic activism than either the French or the German press, it in no way seeks to be separate from the mainstream. The Spanish-language press can be said to be a foreign-dominated press for an ethnic audience that feels its alienation and is still fighting to be equal in order to be incorporated into the mainstream. In contrast, the Yiddish-language press reports the unique interests and culture patterns of its readers and cultivates their separateness as equal but distinct participants on the American scene.

It is important to realize that, on the whole, the support that the French, German and Spanish press samples show for their respective ethnicities is quite similar. Only the Yiddish press sample seems to be significantly firmer in its support of Yiddish ethnicity in the United States. However, the fact that the

Spanish-language press sample is so similar in orientation to the French and German is significant, since it indicates that the Spanish press is *already* at the point of the French and the German, although its readers are more recent and of lower income.

SPANISH LANGUAGE AND ETHNICITY IN THE HISPANIC PRESS WRITTEN IN ENGLISH.

Items in the ethnic mother-tongue press written in English often show more interest in the ethnic mother tongue and in ethnicity (and show it more frequently) than do items written in the ethnic mother tongue itself (Table 8). This is an important finding and worthy of further discussion and inquiry.

Table 8. Percentage of references to EMT and ethnicity, in EMT and in English items of four ethnolinguistic press samples

	French	German	Yiddish	Spanish
EMT references				
EMT items	50.1%	24.4%	29.4%	14.8%
Eng. items	65.1%	24.3%	19.3%	26.8%
Ethnicity references				
EMT items	87.7%	94.7%	97.3%	95.4%
Eng. items	89.8%	99.0%	99.2%	98.5%

The Hispanic press sample consistently reflects this trend (as does the Franco-American press sample), and thus we find higher percentages for both references to Spanish language and Hispanic ethnicity in the items written in English than in the items written in Spanish (See Table 8). Indeed, an overall topical comparison of the ethnicity orientation of the items written in the EMT and the items written in English in our four press samples yields further interesting results (Tables 7 and 9).

There seems to be a slightly lower orientation toward the old country (I. Average Foreign Orientation) in the English language items (Table 9) than in the Ethnic mother-tongue items (Table 7). Yet, except for the Yiddish press sample, the English-language items reveal a somewhat higher interest in maintaining ethnicity in the United States and in ethnic activism than do the corresponding EMT items. This is consonant with the social characteristics of recent ethnic activists in France identified by Beer (1980). In his survey of such activists in France, Beer found that they tended to be people who had consciously adopted the cultural characteristics of their ethnicity *after* childhood as

Table 9. *Percentage of ethnicity references in items written in English in four ethnolinguistic press samples by categories and orientation*

	French	German	Yiddish	Spanish
Old country	32.6%*	27.2%	43.4%	33.8%
Push	1.8%	.6%	7.5%	9.1%
Pull	5.4%	2.9%	9.0%	4.7%
I: Average Foreign Orient.	13.3%	10.2%	20.0%	15.9%
Ethnicity U.S.	8.6%	8.7%	10.7%	11.4%
Ethnic Activism	6.1%	4.0%	1.8%	7.3%
II: Average Ethnic Orient.	7.4%	6.4%	6.3%	9.4%
III: Assimilation Orientation	5.1%	.5%	.4%	2.5%
Total items analyzed	430	206	1828	400

*All figures indicate the percentages of items in a particular press sample which refer to the indicated category. The percentages are rounded to one decimal place. The figures in each column do not add up to 100 percent because one content-analyzed item may cover many of these categories or none at all.

part of a general search for identity. Similarly, for the most part, young Hispanic activists in the United States are not characterized by EMT monolingual fluency or even by good literacy skills in their ethnic mother tongue and, therefore, prefer to write in English. However, it is instructive to realize that although ethnic activists in France had to learn their vanishing ethnic languages in courses and field trips, most young Hispanic activists in the United States are native hispanophones.

The category Assimilation Orientation also shows a greater percentage of references in the English-language items than in Spanish items. This indicates that the writers of these English items, besides having a somewhat higher interest in Hispanic identity in the United States, also identify more strongly with the United States. They may therefore be ambivalent, in conflict, or working out a compromise between their Americanization and their ethnic maintenance/activism.

Items written in English in the Hispanic press present the most ethnically active orientation, while at the same time the most assimilationist orientation. As shown in the Beer analysis (1980), these two factors seem to go hand-in-hand in promoting a revival of ethnic activism. In fact, the 1980 Hispanic items in

English are an example of the continued use of bilingual alternative media (originating in the mid-60s) in order to organize Hispanics around important social and political issues (Gutiérrez, 1980).

The Hispanic items written in English move away significantly from an old-country orientation, and focus on a *new* Hispanic ethnicity in the United States which consists of a closer interaction or coordination of Hispanic and American identity and of the Spanish and the English languages. This growing bilingual/bicultural identity of Hispanics in the United States has been promoted, especially with regard to Puerto Ricans in New York, by the Center for Puerto Rican Studies (Attinasi 1979, Flores 1981, Pedraza 1981). Similar centers in the West and Southwest have related to Chicanos. However, it is important to remember that stable societal diglossia and di-ethnia can only survive if separateness between ethnic groups and the mainstream, on the one hand, and functional compartmentalization between ethnic mother tongues and English on the other hand, are established and retained (Fishman 1980, 1981). In the absence of continual mass immigration and visiting, both of which may become progressively more difficult in the future, Hispanics cannot expect to maintain their identity and their mother tongue beyond the third generation without strong communal and institutional support for their own separate ethnicity and language within the framework of general American culture. The appearance of such continuity is deceptive to Anglos and Hispanics alike. Beneath the surface, the attrition is already major as far as a third generation and beyond is concerned.

CONCLUSIONS

Some conclusions regarding Hispanic publications in the United States flow from our data:

1. The Hispanic press has grown tremendously since 1960, both in number of publications and in circulation. However, its growth is a reflection of increased Spanish-speaking immigration to the United States and not of stabilized communal institutional support for Spanish language and ethnicity. In fact, the Spanish population remains grossly underserved by an ethnic press of its own in the United States when compared to other ethnolinguistic minorities.
2. The Spanish-language press is less interested in the Spanish language than the French, German and Yiddish presses are in their respective ethnic mother tongues. It also shows a much more negative attitude toward its own ethnic mother tongue and toward its own ethnicity.
3. Although the Spanish-language press is as interested in ethnicity as the French, German and Yiddish presses, it shows a much more negative attitude toward Spanish ethnicity than do the other press samples we have studied.

4. The Spanish-language press expresses a stronger foreign orientation (which promotes alienation from the mainstream) than do the French or German press. Yet, the fact that it also manifests a slightly stronger assimilationist orientation is indicative of its attempt to fight for the right of Hispanics to be successfully incorporated into the mainstream. This ethnically active orientation is confirmed by the higher percentage of references to this orientation in the Spanish-language press than in the French and the German press samples. However, the struggle reflected by the Hispanic press is not for separateness and autonomy (as is the case of the Yiddish press), but for equality and integration.

5. The Spanish-language press sample is, on the whole, quite similar in ethnic orientation to the French and the German press samples, with the Yiddish press sample being the most committed to its ethnicity. This finding regarding the Spanish-language press is noteworthy since it shows that it is *already* at the point of the French and the German, although its readers are more recent and of lower income.

6. Although fewer in number, the Hispanic items written in English represent the most frequent ethnic activism of all studied press samples in English. The fact that the English items in the Hispanic press also project the most frequent assimilationist orientation is indicative of a new interactive Hispanic ethnicity being shaped in the United States.

7. The Hispanic press, whether in Spanish or in English, must provide stronger institutional support for the compartmentalization of its languages and the separateness of its ethnic identities. Only then might it be possible for Spanish language and ethnicity to be maintained into the third generation and beyond in the interactive urban environments in which most American Hispanics now live.

The case of Hispanics in the United States differs from that of other American ethnolinguistic groups. Although linguistic assimilation to English has occurred in most cases, Hispanics have not achieved the same degree of structural assimilation into the American economy as the other ethnolinguistic groups. Out of the 11.1 million people over 5 years of age who claimed to speak Spanish at home in the 1980 census, 8.3 million (or 75 percent) claimed that they spoke English very well or well, a startling fact of those who continue to assert that Hispanics have not achieved economic well-being in the American economy because they do not speak English. Yet, when we compare the median income claimed in the 1980 census by families of Spanish origin (\$14,711) with the median income claimed by white families (\$20,840), we see that Hispanics are not doing well. The economic marginality of Hispanics in the United States may well account for some of the pervasive lack of institutionalized community support for either the Spanish language or Hispanic ethnicity. Cultural factors (e.g., the relatively low literacy tradition among many Hispanics) and historical factors (e.g., the federal and local efforts on behalf of Hispanics, as well as their

long-term under-representation in American Catholic institutions) must, as always, also be considered in arriving at a fuller explanation of this phenomenon.

NOTES

1. The 165 total claimed here for the Hispanic press differs from the 174 total identified by Language Resources III. This is due to the fact that for our current analysis the 9 publications appearing in Puerto Rico have been omitted.
2. For a full list of the content analysis variables and their coding alternatives, see Gertner et al., Chapter 9, This Volume.
3. For results of the content analysis of all 51 topics in all four press samples see Gertner et al., Chapter 9, This Volume.
4. The issue of the resurgence of ethnic activism in the second and third generations has been studied by Beer (1980) and Fishman et al. (1982), among others.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alba, Victor. El lenguaje mágico. *Diario La Opinión*. January 5, 1980: 5.
- Atinasi, John. Language attitudes in a New York Puerto Rican community, in Padilla, Raymond V. (ed.), *Bilingual Education and Public Policy in the United States*. Ypsilanti, Eastern Michigan University, 1979, 408-460.
- Beer, William R. *The Unexpected Rebellion: Ethnic Activism in Contemporary France*. New York, New York University Press, 1980.
- Fishman, Joshua A. *Yiddish in America*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1965.
- . *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague, Mouton, 1966.
- . *The Sociology of Language*. Rowley (MA), Newbury House, 1972.
- . Bilingualism and biculturalism as individual and as societal phenomena. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*. 1980, 1, 3-15.
- . Language maintenance and ethnicity. *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism*. 1981, 8, 229-248.
- . Mother-tongue claiming in the United States since 1960: Trends and correlations related to the revival of ethnicity. Chapter 6, This Volume.
- , Robert G. Hayden and Mary E. Warshauer. The non-English and the ethnic group press, 1910-1960, in Fishman, Joshua A. (ed.). *Language Loyalty in the United States*. The Hague, Mouton, 1966, 51-74.
- , Michael H. Gertner, Esther G. Lowy, William G. Milan. Language maintenance, the "ethnic revival" and diglossia in the U.S.A. *Journal of Intercultural Studies*. 1982, 3, no. 1, 5-24.
- , Michael H. Gertner, Esther G. Lowy and William G. Milán. Ethnicity in Action: The Community Resources of Ethnic Languages in the United States. Chapter 7, This Volume.
- Flores, Juan, John Atinasi and Pedro Pedraza, Jr. La carreta made a U-turn: Puerto Rican language and culture in the United States. *Daedalus*. Spring 1981, 193-217.
- Gertner, Michael H., Joshua A. Fishman, Esther G. Lowy and William G. Milán. Language and ethnicity in the periodical publications of four American ethnic groups. Chapter 9, This Volume.

- Grover, Pearce S., Beck J. Barnett and Sandra J. Hansen. *New Mexico Newspapers: A Comprehensive Guide to Bibliographical Entries and Locations*. Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 1975.
- Gutiérrez, Félix. Latino media: An historical overview. *Nuestro*. 1980, 4, 25-28.
- Hudson-Edwards, Alan and Garland D. Bills. Intergenerational language shift in an Albuquerque barrio, in Amastae, Jon and Lucía Elías-Olivares (eds.), *Spanish in the United States: Sociolinguistic Aspects*. Cambridge, Cmmbridge University Press, 1982, 135-153.
- Kloss, Heinz. *The American Bilingual Tradition*. Rowley (MA), Newbury House, 1977.
- La Brie, Henry G. *Perspectives of the Black Press: 1974*. Kennebunkport (ME), Mercer House, 1974.
- Lieberson, Stanley and Timothy J. Curry. Language shift in the United States: Some demographic clues. *International Migration Review*. 1971, 5, 125-157.
- López, David E. Chicano language loyalty in an urban setting. *Sociology and Social Research*. 1976, 62, 167-178.
- . *The Maintenance of Spanish Over Three Generations in the United States*. Los Alamitos, National Center for Bilingual Research, 1982.
- Pedraza, Pedro Jr., John Attinasi and Gerard Hoffman. Rethinking diglossia, in Padilla, Raymond V. (ed.), *Theory in Bilingual Education*. Ypsilanti, Eastern Michigan University, 1981, 76-97.
- Provisional Estimates of Social, Economic and Housing Characteristics. 1980 Census of Population and Housing. PHC 80-SI-1, March 1982.
- Rosado, Olimpia. Cuestiones Gramaticales. *Diario Las Américas*. January 1, 1980: 4.
- Skrabaneck, R.L. Language maintenance among Mexican Americans. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*. 1970, 11, 272-282.
- Stevens, Gillian Anne. Minority Language Loss in the United States. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1982.
- Tinney, James S. and Justine J. Rector. *Issues and Trends in Afro-American Journalism*. Washington, D.C., University Press of America, 1980.
- United States Census of Population. 1970, Report PC(2) 18: *National Origin and Language*. Bureau of the Census.
- Veltman, Calvin. *Language Shift in the United States*. Berlin, Mouton, 1983.

APPENDIX 1. Hispanic Publications Analyzed*

Titles	Frequency	Location	Total Issues Analyzed	Total Items Coded
<i>El Clarín/The Call</i>	W-M	IL	12	63
<i>El Continental</i>	D	TX	34	98
<i>Diario Las Américas</i>	D	FL	33	1096
<i>El Diario La Prensa</i>	D	NY	32	1388
<i>La Gaceta</i>	W	FL	12	79
<i>Gráfica</i>	L	CA	4	67
<i>El Hispano</i>	W	NM	12	50
<i>El Informador</i>	W	IL	6	32
<i>Nuestro</i>	M	NY	10	370
<i>La Opinión</i>	D	CA	32	949
<i>Temas</i>	M	NY	11	194
<i>Total Spanish</i>	—	—	198	4386

Source: Gertner et al., Chapter 9, This Volume.

*The sample for dailies consisted of 4 random weekday and 4 random weekend issues during the following four periods of 1980: January, March, June, and October 15–November 15. For weeklies, three out of four issues during the above mentioned periods were analyzed. For any publication that appeared less often than weekly, every single issue throughout the year was content-analyzed. Similar sampling procedures were followed for the French, German and Yiddish press in the United States.

APPENDIX 2. Listing of topics pertaining to 6 main categories and percentages of references obtained in each.

A. ITEMS IN THE ETHNIC MOTHER TONGUE	French	German	Yiddish	Spanish
<i>1. Foreignness</i>				
Old-country references	42.1%	38.9%	51.9%	39.3%
<i>Average Foreignness</i>	42.1%	38.9%	51.9%	39.3%
<i>2. Push</i>				
Ethnic personal tragedies	.6%	.5%	5.4%	9.5%
Ethnic political-eco. setback	.5%	.3%	10.1%	3.9%
Adversity of migration	.8%	.1%	1.4%	7.9%
Xenophobia	.2%	.0%	.2%	.6%
Rejection, oppression, persec.	2.0%	.8%	16.9%	6.5%
Race and ethnicity	0%	0%	0%	2.3%
<i>Average Push</i>	.7%	.3%	5.6%	5.1%
<i>3. Pull</i>				
Traditions	8.9%	6.5%	7.4%	16.0%
Ancestry, History	13.3%	6.6%	21.8%	16.0%
Roots	2.0%	.4%	3.6%	5.5%
Ethnic family values	.3%	.4%	4.4%	4.3%
Ethnic code of ethics	.3%	.2%	11.0%	4.5%
Ethnic superiority, inferiority	.9%	.4%	.3%	1.5%
Ethnic pride, shame	4.8%	.6%	1.0%	4.9%
Transcendental nationalism	5.2%	.9%	6.5%	12.0%
<i>Average Pull</i>	4.4%	2.0%	7.0%	6.8%
<i>4. Ethnicity U.S.</i>				
Accomplishments individual	33.1%	39.6%	56.4%	47.9%
Ethnic scientific discovery	1.6%	.2%	.4%	2.0%
Ethnic literary wks. EMT	8.7%	6.9%	16.8%	5.8%
Ethnic literary wks. not EMT	.2%	.1%	4.8%	.7%
Ethnic music art drama	12.0%	13.8%	15.5%	19.4%
Ethnic community events	16.4%	40.9%	21.0%	34.0%
Ethnic cultural events	17.9%	17.5%	20.7%	13.5%
Ethnic religious events	9.9%	5.8%	17.2%	9.2%
Ethnic religious observance	13.9%	6.4%	36.6%	11.5%
Ethnic political econo. advn.	1.6%	.5%	9.2%	10.3%
Success ethnic endeavor	.2%	.1%	.5%	2.1%
Cultural pluralism	.5%	0%	.3%	.8%
Biculturalism	.9%	.0%	.2%	1.2%
Ethnic products and services	37.3%	15.7%	16.3%	32.7%
<i>Average Ethnicity U.S.</i>	11.0%	11.3%	16.1%	13.7%

APPENDIX 2. (cont.)

A. ITEMS IN THE ETHNIC MOTHER TONGUE (cont.)	French	German	Yiddish	Spanish
<i>5. Ethnic activism</i>				
Ethnic advocacy	3.3%	.8%	6.6%	7.5%
Ethn. advoc. w/o implement.	1.4%	.7%	.5%	.7%
Ethnic financial appeals	1.9%	1.4%	8.0%	2.6%
<i>Average Ethnic Activism</i>	2.2%	.9%	5.0%	3.6%
<i>6. Assimilation</i>				
Acculturation, assimilation	.5%	.0%	.3%	.8%
<i>Average Assimilation</i>	.5%	.0%	.3%	.8%

B. ITEMS IN ENGLISH	French	German	Yiddish	Spanish
1. <i>Foreignness</i>				
Old-country references	32.6%	27.2%	43.4%	33.8%
<i>Average Foreignness</i>	32.6%	27.2%	43.4%	33.8%
2. <i>Push</i>				
Ethnic personal tragedies	.7%	.5%	16.1%	4.5%
Ethnic political-eco. setback	.9%	.5%	6.7%	7.5%
Adversity of migration	1.2%	.5%	1.1%	16.5%
Xenophobia	0%	.5%	.1%	2.0%
Rejection, oppression, persec.	9.3%	2.9%	21.4%	22.3%
Race and ethnicity	.2%	.0%	.0%	2.3%
<i>Average Push</i>	1.8%	.6%	7.5%	9.1%
3. <i>Pull</i>				
Traditions	.7%	.5%	16.1%	4.5%
Ancestry, History	22.1%	15.0%	26.1%	2.8%
Roots	2.3%	3.4%	4.0%	6.0%
Ethnic family values	.5%	.0%	6.0%	4.3%
Ethnic code ethics	.7%	.0%	7.9%	6.5%
Ethnic superiority, inferior.	2.8%	1.0%	.4%	1.5%
Ethnic pride shame	11.6%	.5%	7.3%	.1%
Transcendental nationalism	2.8%	2.4%	3.8%	11.5%
<i>Average Pull</i>	5.4%	2.9%	9.0%	4.7%
4. <i>Ethnicity U.S.</i>				
Accomplishments individual	28.1%	23.8%	37.6%	51.3%
Ethnic scientific discovery	.9%	1.0%	.4%	9.5%
Ethnic literary wks, EMT	1.6%	1.0%	5.3%	6.3%
Ethnic literary wks not EMT	.7%	.0%	11.9%	4.5%
Ethnic music art drama	1.9%	3.4%	10.9%	17.8%
Ethnic community events	16.7%	42.7%	3.6%	6.0%
Ethnic cultural events	13.0%	5.8%	24.3%	4.5%
Ethnic religious events	3.0%	1.9%	3.7%	1.5%
Ethnic religious observance	6.3%	1.5%	35.1%	4.0%
Ethnic political econo. advn.	4.0%	.0%	6.5%	27.0%
Success ethnic endeavor	.2%	.0%	.0%	2.5%
Cultural pluralism	1.2%	1.0%	.1%	3.0%
Biculturalism	.5%	.0%	.1%	5.3%
Ethnic products and services	41.6%	31.6%	10.9%	16.0%
<i>Average Ethnicity U.S.</i>	8.6%	8.7%	10.7%	11.4%
5. <i>Ethnic activism</i>				
Ethnic advocacy	9.5%	6.3%	2.8%	20.3%
Ethnic advoc. w/o implement	5.8%	3.9%	.3%	.8%
Ethnic financial appeals	3.0%	1.9%	2.5%	1.0%
<i>Average Ethnic activism</i>	6.1%	4.0%	1.8%	7.3%
6. <i>Assimilation</i>				
Acculturation, assimilation	5.1%	.5%	.4%	2.5%

Chapter 11

The Significance of the Ethnic-Community
Mother-Tongue School

JOSHUA A. FISHMAN

THE TITLE VII BLINDERS

Our collective fascination (or is it horror?) with respect to publicly subsidized and conflicted bilingual education in the U.S.A. (usually referred to cryptically as "Title VII" bilingual education, after the section of the Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act which first appropriated funds for it) has made us blind to several other kinds of bilingual education that abound—and that have always been plentifully present—in our own midst and, indeed, throughout educational history. Glyn Lewis (1976) has done us a distinct service, one among many such, by introducing us to the early history of bilingual education in the Euromediterranean basin. For literally thousands of years before the appearance of mass ("public") education, political, religious, commercial and cultural elites educated their children bilingually. The recognized local/regional and supralocal/supraregional languages of record, administration, justice, trade and enlightenment changed over the centuries in accord with the fortunes of war, royal alliances, migration (forced and voluntary), language spread, and intergroup contact, but again and again a bilingual education pattern appears among those fortunate enough to receive literacy-related education. Bilingual education, formal education and social advantage were synonymous for centuries, and remain so to this very day, for the children of elites throughout the world. The pattern involved is clearly different from that of Title VII, where *disadvantage* rather than *advantage* is the hallmark both of bilingual education and of the population involved in it.

Coming closer to home, Shirley Heath has begun to reveal to us the early role of bilingual education in the fashioning of American public education (1977; also see Heath and Mandach 1983). From the beginning of education in the colonies (and continuing into the twentieth century in many areas), newcomers